

Salvatore Messina
368 Third Ave
West Haven, CT 06516

March 23, 2011

Joint Committee on Judiciary
Room 2500, Legislative Office Building
Hartford, CT 06106

**RE: Oppose SB 1094 An Act Banning Large Capacity Magazines.
Oppose SB 1096 An Act Concerning the Criminal Possession and Seizure of Ammunition.
Support SB 1210 An Act Concerning The Use of Physical Deadly Force to Defend the Residents
of a Home
Support HB 6490 An Act Establishing A Procedure For Relief From Certain Federal Firearms
Prohibitions**

Dear Judiciary Committee Members,

I Oppose SB 1094 & SB 1096 for the following reasons:

- Firearms are designed to be used with the specific magazine supplied by the manufacturer for purposes of safety and reliability.
- As written, SB 1094 would mean a significant forfeiture & confiscation of Connecticut Residents' personal property by Police totaling many millions of dollars.
- SB 1094 is an Ex Post Facto law which is unconstitutional under Article 1, Section 9, Clause 3 of the Federal Constitution which specifically prohibits punishing conduct that was legal prior to new legislation becoming law.
- SB 1094 is discriminatory by calling for the criminal prosecution of law abiding citizens.
- Connecticut does not have any legislation which provides mandatory minimum sentencing for violent felons in possession of any magazine regardless of capacity.
- SB 1094 puts law abiding residents at a tactical disadvantage, but does nothing to prevent violent repeat offenders, that are the source of most homicides, from using any magazine they wish with impunity and without punishment.
- Connecticut Residents' were already subject to similar magazine restrictions from 1994-2004 under provisions of the Federal Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. Violent Crime Totals and per capita Violent Crime Rates were higher during this period (1994-2004) and lower from 2004-2009 according to FBI Uniform Crime Report Statistics.
- Additionally, Average Murder rates per capita were considerably higher from 1994-2004 at 3.88 murders per 100,000 residents, conversely from 2004-2009

average murder rates per capita dropped to 3.30 per 100,000 according to the FBI Uniform Crime Report. These figures beg the question: Why do we need SB 1094 when we have a declining violent crime rate?

- SB 1094 diminishes a person's right to adequate self-protection using modern firearms. When we consider that the 1860 Henry Rifle carried 15 cartridges we can better understand just how draconian and out of touch SB 1094 is with its' 10 shot limitation.

Oppose SB 1096

- SB 1096 makes no sense at all since ammunition can't be used without a firearm. Court restraining and protective orders do not constitute a criminal conviction. First time offenders could face Police entrapment if later found in possession of a single cartridge. Police Transportation and Storage costs of seized ammunition would not justify enactment of SB 1096.

I Support SB 1210 for the following reasons:

- SB 1210 rightly presumes the homeowner is the victim of a crime rather than the homeowner having to prove in court to a jury that they were not an aggressor in using deadly force.
- SB 1210 leaves nothing to judicial interpretation or review as to what constitutes a reasonable belief in using deadly physical force to defend oneself or family from a person(s) unlawfully entering ones dwelling.
- Connecticut home invasions have become more common in recent years most notably with the Petit case. Residents need to know that they can use deadly force against unlawful intruders without fear of prosecution.
- SB 1210 keeps existing legislation in place (sections 53b-19 & 53c-19) that clearly defines what is and what is not a justifiable use of deadly force.